

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Strategic Challenges: Transforming the Total Force Vision for the 21st Century”

May 19-20 2003

A Symposium at
National Defense University
Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, DC
Sponsored by The Reserve Forces Policy Board

Key Insights

Mission

- **Maintain Title 1- and Title 3 unique capabilities and responsibilities. Maintain service unique capabilities.**
- **Develop portfolio of RC capabilities for both expeditionary warfare and homeland defense**
- **Plan for flexibility and reliability in RC missions and “on call” for deployment time periods**
- **Design doctrine to support transformation that supports operational availability but is still tailorable and flexible**

Doctrine

- **The RC must train and fight joint, integrate and be on an equal footing with the AC in training, equipment, benefits, utilization**
- **Force structure must support the GWOT steady state**
- **Develop correct mission balance between the RC and AC first, and then work on force mix**
- **Support development of auxiliary forces**

Employment

- **Cafeteria style Employment Model with a variety of options and combinations**
- **Full RC participation in equipment modernization and access to simulations and gaming**
- **Capitalize on critical civilian skills especially in the IT arena**
- **Determine rotating and standing forces to conduct experimentation**

Citizen Connectivity

- **Continue with efforts/programs to facilitate connectivity with the public**
- **Explore national service options and outreach programs**
- **Continue with transformation initiatives focusing on the needs of the future**
- **Increase emphasis on Citizen Patriot links and contacts**

Introduction:

This was the Reserve Forces Policy Board's first annual symposium, focusing fully on Reserve component missions, doctrine, employment and citizen connectivity. This year's topic – "Strategic Challenges: Transforming the Total Force Vision for the 21st Century" was particularly relevant because it occurred during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Over 200 senior leaders from academe, government, industry, public organizations and private policy related institutions, Department of Defense and military leaders – active and reserve, including over 50 flag ranking officers – participated. With the unfolding war and campaign as a backdrop, speakers and forum discussants used clear topical examples to make their points.

Four major forums presented views related to the symposium's four main topics on the first day and four breakout sessions addressed the questions raised by those forums on the second day. Those four forums served to allow participants to examine the Reserve component's primary mission, emerging doctrine, employment and the Reserve Component link to their public constituency. The Symposium attracted high level presenters from the Department of Defense and the Congress. All seven Reserve component service chiefs participated, as did all Reserve Forces Policy Board Members, alumni, congressional staffers, academics, private sector and community leaders, first responders, members of the news media, state and local government representatives, the Guardian Angels and National Defense University staff and faculty.

A summary briefing was prepared during the second day session from the breakout sessions and including key action recommendations as determined by the forum chairs. The Chairman of the Board will present their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. As these recommendations are presented, they will form the basis and the motivation of the Board's way ahead next year. They will result in a formal Proceedings report and an RC focused issue of the Joint Forces Quarterly. The results will also drive the Board's focus in preparation of the Annual Report for 2003 and begin the cycle of preparations for the 20024 Symposium.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

Keynote Address: "National Military Strategy - Reserve component Implications" – General Peter Pace, USMC, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

General Peter Pace, Vice Chairman of the Joint Staff, spoke on Operation Iraqi Freedom using the theme "Jointness Comes of Age." General Pace assessed the effectiveness of our military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, highlighting the application of precision weaponry, flexible planning, agile execution, and speed as force multipliers. He observed that firepower application historically required large tonnage of bombs and artillery in achieving target destruction. In contrast Iraqi Freedom demonstrated the use of single weapon's precision fire ability to destroy many targets. Precision fires are seen as an integral component of maneuver warfare and are truly joint. He illustrated the use of special operations with SEALs, AFSOC and

Marines. Speed of movement and precision fire application transformed the way of war – literally becoming a “new way of war.” Planning and execution at all levels – tactical, operational and strategic – enhanced by real time situational awareness – dramatically shifted timelines. Speed of planning, speed of movement, speed of precision fire application – totally integrated in ground, sea and air forces - resulted in destruction of the enemy forces.

—Speed of mobilization was an essential and logistics were likewise important, particularly in utilization of prepositioned equipment. The use of the RC in these campaigns is essential. **Yet the mobilization processes demand dramatic process change.** Units need a process, which maximizes timely alert notification. General Pace observed that headquarters typically use too much notification time, leaving too little time for the unit itself to react and be mobilized. He felt that the RC would play a key role in the defense of the Homeland. Key recommended changes include the force mix, and the organizational construct of the reserve Components.

Keynote Speaker: Dr. Stephen J. Trachtenberg, *President, George Washington University, and Professor of Public Administration*

Dr. Steven Trachtenberg, gave a stirring speech on the need for mandatory national service to infuse a shared national vision. He presented the theme of service and education, asking “What ever happened to the concept of national service?” He stated that, public schools need to be involved in this

process to insure both fluency in English and establishment of a common American identity. The common cohesive vision through a concept of national service will become the school of the nation. This school will lead to better understanding of military and public service. The concept of the citizen soldier serving the nation will lead to a fairer mix of classes.

At present the upper classes have no shared burden and the burden of service has shifted to the lower classes. At present there is no maximum synergy between energy and brains – national service would reinvigorate this relationship. We are presented today with the opportunity for a common vision. There is also in education today “a disconnect between academic and student.” Training and education of the RC will de-mystify the relationship between the military and academe.

Special Guest Speaker Honorable Newt Gingrich, *Former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and CEO of the Gingrich Group*

From the political perspective, the Honorable Mr. Newt Gingrich gave a forceful dinner keynote address on homeland security, the impact of domestic terror, and **the need for a shorter response time for RC mobilization.** Mr. Gingrich began with a warning: “We are in a period of crisis. What we do here in regard to the utilization of the RC during this crisis and beyond is critical to our country. We could lose this country unless we act.” He further advised: “We are in a new era where real time weapons of mass destruction (WMD) particularly the biological threat can effect 35% to 90%

of our population. This is not hype. The threat is real. We are waiting for the ‘other shoe to drop.’” Mr. Gingrich indicated that this event will make 9/11 look pale by comparison. In his view, this WMD threat cannot be pre-empted by military strikes. Hence we must get ready for this threatened strike.

Mr. Gingrich reminded participants that **militarily we are structured for the industrial age and now need to enter the information age.** He commented that change is constant – and we need to accept this constancy. He cautioned us to think about coalition partners – for example, in the anthrax case; to think about time: Six internet years are like 100 years. He reminded us that previous thinking of jointness was that it applied above the level of tactics; today’s application of jointness is at every level. Operation Iraqi Freedom and Afghanistan particularly showed the links at tactical and strategic level. He indicated that there is now a need for a central system to disseminate knowledge, which distributes rapid dissemination of unclassified lessons learned and an on going analysis of the learned methodology.

Keynote Speaker “Transforming Reserve Component Readiness” – General Larry R. Ellis, Commander U.S. Army Forces Command

—General Ellis addressed the state of RC readiness and how readiness can be transformed. He focused on the continuum of service and the need for improved readiness of the RC. He proposed a series of specific approaches to address these readiness issues, including the need for a seamless personnel and pay system for active and reserve forces. He reviewed the need for

equitable training and education opportunities for reservists, particularly for leader development.

General Ellis noted that the question of “who funds activities during alert for mobilization?” remains unanswered. In the legislative arena, he recommended a single tri-component funding line with no restrictions on AC/RC equipment use, and medical and dental care equitability. **Central to his presentation was the need for a balance between active and reserve forces, and the mix of those forces.**

Keynote Speaker: “The Combatant Commander: Your Ultimate Customer” – Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., Commander, Joint Forces Command

ADM Edmund Giambastiani spoke on the critical theme of military transformation. He presented a thumbnail sketch of his top ten lists, which emphasized the strengthened role of joint war fighting at every level. He plans to use joint exercises to emplace transformational requirements. Key transformational tenets include lighter joint force, utilization of all available forces and experimentation and demonstrations through the use of live, virtual and constructive simulation methodologies. He opined that we must allow an experiment to run its course, even if this means allowing for failure. Within this approach, simulations will help in the conduct of the experiment. Simulation and modeling use can precede the experiment and thereby be useful in guiding the experiment through operational concepts and designs that have been virtually proved successful.

He advocated the need for mission rehearsal – changing from embedded training to mission rehearsal. He plans to change the existing Reserve component sequence of alert, mobilize, deploy to a simple alert – deploy. In summary, Admiral Giambastiani **presented the case for jointness in every facet of training through demonstrations and exercises and the deployment of forces.**

Keynote Speaker: Congressman Steve Buyer (R, Indiana), Co-Chairman, House National Guard and Reserve Components Caucus

Congressman Buyer, himself a reservist, presented a challenge to the participants during his keynote presentation: transform the Reserves, now! Use of the RC in the War on Terror and in the current series of campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan is at an historic high. He observed that we are using Reserves too much. This utilization cannot be sustained unless comprehensive approaches are undertaken. He reminded the audience “that Guardsmen and Reservists want to serve; they want to be guardsmen and reservists. That is why they joined – most of those who serve do not want to be active soldiers, sailor, airmen or marines: keep that in mind!” Mr. Buyer was not satisfied with the continual incremental approach to change. **He strongly suggested the need for force re-balancing.**

Representative Buyer examined the need for better strength management. He felt there were too many proposals before Congress on military pay and entitlements, and this incremental view of benefits needed to be changed to

present the entire benefits issue at one time. He recommended change in the force structure and mix, because the “as is” mix of RC commitments is unacceptable due to OPTEMPO. Further, the balance issue must be resolved.

Forum I Keynote Speaker Honorable Thomas F. Hall, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs

Mr. Hall was the keynote speaker for a panel discussion on the primary missions of the Reserve components in support of the national security objectives. Secretary Hall’s keynote accented the challenges the Reserves face. The RC only accounts for 8.2% of the DOD budget, yet RC are now supporting the active forces with over 240,000 Reservists. This is a historic high. The major issue facing governors and employers today, is forecasting deployments. Another major concern is RC family health care coverage, particularly when soldiers are deployed.

Secretary Hall asked rhetorically: **Is the Total Force concept dead? Is this policy still working? Can it work?** Certainly the mobilization concept of operations is center stage during war, but what is the policy in the future? Mobilization as a concept and as a process has dominated our thinking. We know that on any given day we now have approximately 50,000 Reservists on active duty. So the question Mr. Hall posed was, “What is the steady state of Reserves who are being called upon to perform certain duties?” If this number is about 50,000 then let us recognize this and codify it. There is a need to recognize what mix of reserve and active forces are required under this steady

state of present and future conditions. Inherent in the AC/RC mix is the protection of the homeland within the context of the conduct of a global campaign. We need to have the right structure for the conduct of this global campaign. Secretary Hall noted that **there is a need for a seamless flow between the personnel policies of both active and reserves.**

With Dr. Michael Krause moderating the panel, Secretary Hall, Dr. Michael Doubler, Dr. Lewis “Bob” Sorley, and Ms. Lynda Davis examined the various past influences that have shaped the primary missions of the RC. One important influence was the militia concept. **In our history, there are three fundamentals, that should be considered: volunteers, a mix of state and federal missions and overseas deployments.** As we look at the AC/RC future, we should remember these three fundamentals. Another fact, which shaped the mission of the Reserves, was the utilization of active and only limited reserves during the Vietnam War. American will waned during the Vietnam War. This lack of public support for the fighting forces led to the formulation of a force structure placing heavy reliance of combat units in the National Guard and combat service support and combat service support units into the Reserves.

Hence the mission of the RC was to reinforce the active force upon declaration of war. The essentials of the Total Force Plan were to mobilize Reserve units in the event of war. In this plan, the active forces could not easily go to war without RC mobilization. Reserve connectivity to the American public community would assure full

public support of the military engaged in the conflict. General Abrams, the Army Chief of Staff, developed the Total Force structure concept, to assure that the will of the nation would be fully committed, when military forces were used. Even though the force structure changed, the mission of the reserves did not: The Reserves continue to reinforce the active forces when mobilized and committed to war. This Total Force structure concept needs to be considered when additional missions are added.

The addition of a new mission is not an either or proposition for the Reserve Forces. Inherent in the Departmental name – Department of Homeland Security and Department of Defense are two missions. There may now be recognition of a new a stabilization mission inherent in nation building – as in Iraq and Afghanistan – and peace keeping in nations around the world: There is now a need to build the infrastructure for democracy. Inherently there is a dual mission with multi jurisdictions – but it must be a joint setting. There is now a definitive need for civil support operations. Embedded in the Guard, is the sense of community, whether committed to a mission either at home or abroad. The Guard and Reserves bring this support of the community with them. And within this future commitment, the mission of the Reserve is changing.

Forum II Keynote Speaker:
Honorable Stephen Cambone, *Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence*

Dr. Cambone was the lead speaker for a panel discussion on how emerging doctrine is redefining the Total Force with a focus on mission balance, rapid and early deployments, and long-

term joint operations. He recounted the steps toward transformation of the military beginning with President Bush's redefinition of the nature of war to a preventive and preemptive doctrine. Thus, military transformation is not only embedded in promulgation of doctrine, organizations and equipment, but perhaps most importantly is realized in cultural transformation. We now have new guidance, such as NSC policy and the national military strategy to give us the focus and direction. There are changes required, particularly in the fields of acquisition, procurement and logistics. Organizational changes, such as the creation of NORTHCOM, STRATCOM/SPACECOM and the Department of Homeland Security, demonstrate the transformational fact that **"jointness has come of age."**

There is an on-going momentum for transformational change: speed of operations and precision strike capabilities indicate the strength of this change. These matters are urgent, since we are at war, a war that is unlikely to be short. A constituency from Governors, Service Chiefs and Reserve Chiefs are particularly interested in homeland defense, but the RC will likely play in both foreign and domestic missions. One of the issues discussed is how to distribute capabilities so as to manage the increased OPTEMPO particularly for the Reserve components. While the CJCS is working force balance issues, and while the answers are not obvious, force management and force mixture is a problem. These issues must be addressed. **One of the key tenets of change, will be joint training** versus training by services.

Forum II Keynote Speaker VADM (USN, Ret.) Arthur K. Cebrowski,
Director, Office of Force Transformation, OSD

VADM Cebrowski discussed transformation of our military forces which requires a broadening of the RC capability base. Transformation reflects a shift of the military focus from fighting great power wars to fighting as a great power force. There is a "new American way of war" emerging based in part on the substitution of information technology for mass. There is a misalignment of roles and missions from the industrial age, which needs to be transposed to the informational age. One of the things that we now see very broadly is that information technology is running well ahead of the physical domain.

Previously our forces were structured to be reactive and punitive, in the new way of warfare our forces must be structured to be proactive and preemptive. This places a premium on small, fast, light, agile – "high speed" units that have all of the attributes of depths of effects, mobile targeting, persistent surveillance mentioned by the previous speaker. So right now our force structure is "misaligned." How capital intensive vs. labor intensive are our units? Technology helps, but only up to a point. Labor-intensive units are in chemical biological, military police, staffing, and intelligence guard units as examples. Logistic units are presently labor intensive. We are doing things at the front end and we want our allies to do things at the back end of the conduct of war. We have a broad spectrum of responsibility – they have almost a niche responsibility. But our potential is not uniform. Reserve components need to be

transformed the same way, from labor intensive to information technology intensive.

Dr. James Carafano moderated this panel comprising Secretary Cambone, Admiral Cebrowski, Dr. Daniel Goure, and Mr. Jack Spencer. They discussed how emerging doctrine for the Total Force can be built with focus on mission balance, rapid and early deployments, and long-term joint operations.

There are no long-term, large-scale mobilizations forecasted, short of a World War IV scenario. Rather the problem is short/medium term mobilizations for combat followed by longer occupations or stability operations. What force structure is needed for support or stabilization operations? It is likely that the new Homeland Security Department will be overwhelmed and will require support from DoD to accomplish mission. Most likely this support will come from RC. It is equally likely that the RC may become “fractioned,” pulled to separate commitments, between homeland defense and expeditionary warfare – the home and away game analog. We need to balance in both domains; and the answers here are not obvious or simple. Perhaps we must consider outsourcing work using the examples of military training in Bosnia, Kosovo etc.

More technology from the security world needs to be added to the Reserve components including unmanned air and ground systems. Lastly, the use of the best available commercial systems – essentially to manage the systems should be considered.

Certainly the attack on 9/11 changed the nature of war and thereby changed the nature of transformational requirements. Now, how do we update and transform the Reserve components in this global war against terrorism? We do not have a single front in this war, but rather a war that is fought both at home and abroad. At home we need to become more capable of responding, with enlarged and more robust capabilities to a multiplicity of threats. The RC is best suited for this. There will need to be a change in the law on equipping, training and structuring to better serve the Reserve components. Organizationally, we need to look at the laws that constrain the personnel system and the processes of the Reserve components and adjust them according to the changed defense of the homeland mission. There are cultural, funding, and connectivity issues associated with each of these changes, but essential is the need to enhance RC capabilities so that they can respond quickly and decisively.

The title 10 and 32 authorities must change over the next ten years to allow the most effective and continual war of homeland and global defense. There will need to be specialization of the Reserve Components. One aspect of this specialization could be in stability operations and in the conduct of nation rebuilding. The “new vision requirement” must change the culture, which places the RC “as a force in reserve.” The RC must be sized, structured, and equipped so that a continual defense can be conducted. The statutory laws come from a two-century need; these laws have served well. As we change the statutory authority we must be sure to continue to build trust in the institutions that have served so well. Right now we know that over 200,000

Reservists on duty all over the world will not be sustainable in the long run.

The question of keeping the RC as a strategic reserve is one of profound importance. The current level of mobilization is probably not sustainable. For continuing operations like we're seeing now, we need to make some space between the AC and RC. This will require analyzing where the biggest risks will be in 5-10-15 years, and design the AC/RC mixture to meet that threat, because that's how long it will take to make the changes happen. But these decisions will need to be made in the next 6 to 8 months.

Forum III Keynote Speaker:
Honorable Paul F. McHale, *Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense*

The implications of transformation and the 9/11 attacks were inherent in Secretary McHale's speech. He presented seven issues, which confront NORTHCOM, including its relationship with the National Guard, Posse Comitatus, and Title 10/Title 32 mix.

Mr. McHale pointed out that an important consideration is the assignment of land forces to NORTHCOM, particularly for training. Forces that will be operationally assigned when the need arises need to be ready, trained, missioned and known by the command. In short, those forces that are required for the defense of the nation need to be "in a serious relationship" with NORTHCOM. He discussed Title 32 versus Title 10 authorities for forces as well, noting that this is a serious question that has yet to be resolved. Likewise, the relationship between NORTHCOM, the Department of

Homeland Security and the National Guard be further defined.

MG Richard O. Wightman Jr., moderated this panel to focus on the employment of the Reserve components. With Secretary McHale and each of the Reserve Forces Chiefs participating - LTG H Steven Blum, USA; LTG James R. Helmly, USA; LtGen Dennis M. McCarthy, USMC; VADM John B. Totushek, USNR; Lt Gen James E. Sherrard, III, USAF; and RADM Robert J. Papp, Jr. USCG; each considered the need for a new employment and service paradigm for the Reserve components - one that reflects the changing patterns of use and enhances the capabilities of our military forces. Each of the service chiefs presented their service views on the emerging employment doctrine, organization and structure. Central consideration was the dichotomy between Homeland defense - which the National Guard and the Reserves can do well - and the continual support of active forces in global expeditionary warfare. Further, new missions such as stability operation and nation building give an entirely new dimension to the force structure, balance, mix and employment considerations.

The relationship of ground forces to NORTHCOM was discussed, particularly the National Guard and Reserve element. A central perspective was the participants' recognition that if the military goes to war, it is planning on taking the National Guard and Reserve with it. Hence a central planning and structure questions is: How can the National Guard and Reserves be committed to homeland defense, and who will do homeland security if the National Guard and Reserve leave?

LTG Blum began the panel by advocating a new National Guard concept, which reflects the old “Minute Man” tradition. He indicated that the National Guard should be able to defend the United States when we go to the “away game.” We certainly have the same concept for defense of the Homeland. We do need to work out the NORTHCOM – land component – Reserve Component and National Guard relationship for all aspects of commitment of forces. LTG Blum said that joint training will be key.

LTG Helmly articulated the need to realistically structure the Reserves so that all missions – support of active forces in expeditionary warfare, support of homeland defense security needs and potentially stability operations – can be satisfied. This realism must be capabilities based. What is required to support all of these missions, balanced by recognition of the time requirements? This time dimension needs to be measured with the unit’s commitment. Reserve capabilities must be so structured that trained units – not just individuals – are committed over time. He pointed out that **capability requirements must drive employment**. The time must be considered when a unit deploys and returns, in short the commitment time. An example is to structure, one of kind units, so that there are enough of them to rotate into a forecasted contingency.

LtGen McCarthy, in commenting on the continuum of service, noted that OSD and RA have the right approach. The Total Force approach for example does not fit all services - so that the one size approach does not fit all! Therefore

the continuum of service as a policy must affect each service and must be considered differently. By contrast, Marine mobilization during the period 1990 till 2002 was the smallest, including Desert Shield and Desert Storm. However, now with Iraqi Freedom this commitment is the highest. So we need to look at the continuum of service most critically.

VADM Totushek pointed out that mobilization is changing. Dollar investments are needed. We have an open mobilization system and it is network centric, but we have not invested any dollars in the mobilization process. What is critical is that 100% of some capabilities need to stay in the reserves. **It is essential that we have the right mix with the required effectiveness.** The nation cannot afford more than is required.

Lt Gen Sherrard indicated that each service Reserve component is different and **“the Reserves can be as good as the AC service lets us be, with funding and manpower being the key elements.”** In the Air Force reserves mobilizations don’t start from a full stop. For example fully 39% of AF Reservists are working every day, and many AFRes crews were in the airlift system and simply continue on when mobilized.

RADM Papp reminded the participants that the Coast Guard is a small organization of approximately 38,000 men and women. He reviewed the employment of over 50% of the 8,000 Reservists, which is small by absolute numbers, but when measured as a percentage of utilization it is largest yet of any service.

Forum IV Keynote Speaker: Senator Lindsey Graham (R, South Carolina)

Senator Graham was the keynote speaker for a forum discussion regarding the need for new commitment by Citizen Patriots. He indicated that we must drive technology to provide instant information sharing across government. Senator Lindsay Graham described legislative initiatives to reduce RC retirement age, provide tax credits to RC employers, and improve RC health care.

Mr. John Rendon, moderated this forum which featured discussants – Mr. Tony Blankley, Mr. Robert Thomas, Ms. Helena Ashby, Dr. Thomas McGinn, III, Mr. John Winkler, and Mr. Arnaldo Salinas - representing first responders, media, local government leaders and private organizations.

Final comments indicated that there are many Americans potentially interested in volunteering: Retirees, older reservists, and new immigrants. There are volunteer organizations that can be expanded. For example, the Civil Air Patrol, the Coast Guard Auxiliary. There may be medical volunteers to treat mass casualties. There will also be a medical need for military assistance to civil authorities.

Forum Breakout Discussion Groups:

The Symposium's second day concerned the construction of four groups to work on the questions of (1) Reserve Component Roles and Missions - led by Secretary Reginald Brown, ASA/M&RA; (2) Towards an Emerging Doctrine for the 21st Century - led by Secretary Michael Dominguez, ASAF/M&RA; (3) New Availabilities and Service Employment Paradigms led by Secretary William Navas,

ASN/M&RA; and (4) The Citizen Patriot and Building Public Constituency, led by MG Richard Wightman, Military Executive to the RFPB. Each question was broken into four subtopics with small groups working on each. After lunch, each group leader presented the conclusions of his group.

Summary of the Breakout Findings and Discussion

Forum I: Honorable Reginald Brown,

Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; VADM Mark Feichtinger, USNR, Maj Gen John E. Spiegel, USAF, Maj Gen Frances Wilson, USMC, Dr. Michael Krause and Mr. Charles Arce.

This panel considered the question: What are the primary missions of the RC? The panel's perspective was that the mission of the RC remains the historical mission – that is - to support and defend the nation. For the Reserve Components this mission must now be considered in two dimensions: Homeland Defense and the support of expeditionary campaigns. Within these two missions there are several perspectives. The first perspective considers the RC as a force in strategic reserve; secondly, as an operational force multiplier; thirdly, as a force for defense; and, fourthly as a stabilization force in support of expeditionary campaigns. This latter consideration would help to create the conditions for success in “winning the peace” following a military campaign.

The panel evaluated the primary mission and its relationship to the Total Force Structure approach – known as the Abrams Doctrine – and how it contributes to public and political will.

One perspective was that the Total Force structure is not as effective with the change in national security and military strategy to one of preemption. **Another perspective maintained the need to continue Service Title 10 capabilities and responsibilities for both wartime and homeland defense.** The panel wanted to maintain and balance the unique RC capabilities throughout the transformation process. Key recommendations were to examine the force structure between the AC and RC and the adoption of future roles and missions in homeland defense and expeditionary warfare.

Forum II: Honorable Michael Dominguez, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; MG Raymond F. Rees, USA; RADM John Cotton, USNR; RADM Robert Papp, Jr. USCG; Dr. James Carafano and Dr. John Blair. The central question for the panel was: “How to build the emerging doctrine for the Total Force with a focus on mission balance, rapid deployment and long-term joint operations? The forum answered this question by validating the need for public and political support in the employment of forces. **If the RC goes to war they must have the support of the people.** This centrality comes from the national security strategy and flows through the need for part time and full time forces

The RC should be structured organized and trained to Service Department requirements, with association with active units for training and operational execution. The forum’s perspective indicated that speed and effectiveness of RC is critical. . The RC must have the required funding for

implementation. In re-balancing the Reserve Forces the present and future operational tempo must be considered. RC training must consider high demand and low-density units in order to meet the mission requirements.

The forum indicated that balance is essential in meeting the future mission needs of the Total Force. The RC should receive equipment based on mission; it should have capabilities that allow it to execute the mission; equipment and manning must have technology that allow communication with all services and the Department of Homeland Security. Manning the RC must include **personnel interchangeability** between components and **the same pay and medical care systems.** An innovative perspective of the forum was to include auxiliary and volunteer organizations to assist with specific missions. Key forum recommendations were: the RC must be budgeted into the AC war plans; a streamlined chain of command for Reserve component integration into the active forces; the RC must fit service component mission; there must be a correct mission balance between RC and AC; equal benefits must apply to both.

Forum III: Honorable William A. Navas, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, MG Charles E. Wilson, USAR; RADM Grant Hollett, USNR (Ret); Maj Gen John Bradley, USAF; Maj Gen Leo V. Williams III, USMCR; COL Mari K. Eder and Mr. Richard Odenthal. This panel considered the question of employment of the RC and focused on the question: Do we need a new availability and service paradigm for the Reserve component – one that reflects

the changing patterns of use and enhances the capability of our military forces?

The panel perspective reflected the changed circumstance since we were attacked on 9/11. The panel's insight included the need to formulate and formalize an employment doctrine for both Homeland Defense and war fighting capabilities. This insight includes use of a new **rotational-based force with a predictable forecast of reserve utilization**. Insights on modernization included full funding for training of the RC, including use of simulation and distance learning capabilities. There are also certain critical civilian skills inherent in the RC, which have a high payoff.

These skills include the IT, medical, hard sciences, contract management and linguistic knowledge. Another panel insight addressed the need for institutional and structural changes required to realize the employment concepts for the Reserve components. The role of NORTHCOM needs to be defined in its operational relationship with the RC and the political state leadership. A key perspective pointed to the need for scheduled rotational employment of the RC. The forum's approach was to recommend congruent legislation and policy changes that facilitate full integration of all components. Cultural obstacles to experimentation included limitations in the joint training and experimentation arena. The forum recommended that RC units should be identified for joint demonstration and experimentation. Key recommendations included streamlining the mobilization process and creation of a new service paradigm to reform transform and modernize.

Forum IV: MG Richard O.

Wightman Jr., USA, Military

Executive to the Reserve

Forces Policy Board; MG Tim Haake, USAR; RADM Mary P. O'Donnell, USCGR; MG Paul Bergson (USA Ret); Mr. Bryan Sharratt; Mr. John Rendon, Ms. Helena Ashby and Mr. John Brinkerhoff.

The panel considered how to best link the public constituency of the Reserve components to build a Citizen Patriot. The key panel insight was that the basic constituency of the RC is the community. Their connection to the community is in its every day commitment - through family, employers, neighbors and community action. Forum members advocated the concept of mandatory national service – discussed by a leading educator. Another insightful panel perspective was the use of voluntary organization to assist in executing some of the missions of Homeland Defense.

The concept that every RC member has a military-related story to tell within the community is key. One insight concerned the prototype Citizen Patriot, building on citizen involvement for a national “neighborhood watch” as well as for response and mitigation for law enforcement, auxiliaries, Civil Air patrols, Guardian Angels and civilian specialties and skills. The forum indicated that the **RC should take the lead in forming partnerships, defining the missions and conducting training and exercises**. Key recommendations are: continue with efforts and programs to facilitate connectivity with the public; explore the concept of national service and outreach programs; continue with

transformation initiatives focusing on the needs of the future; and, increase emphasis on Citizen Patriot links and contacts.

The Way Ahead. The Honorable Albert Zapanta, Chairman, Reserve Force Policy Board.

The Chairman planned to brief the results of the symposium to the Secretary of Defense, providing him with the direct inputs and feedback from participants. A formal report of the conference proceedings will be published by the end of the summer along with a Reserve component - focused issue of the Joint Forces Quarterly. This issue is planned for publication in Winter 2003. The results of the conference will also drive the Reserve Forces Policy Board's focus in preparation of the 2003 annual report and will begin the cycle of preparations for the 2004 Symposium.

The Symposium further served to focus the Board's efforts in determining that the Board's way ahead will be one noted for its partnerships and its products. These include:

- A working partnership with US Joint Forces Command. This Board task force will concentrate on forming important relationships and connections with the force providers in both constructing mobilization and demobilization lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom and in the implementation of those lessons in joint operations.

- A working partnership with US Northern Command. This task force will work with the Command on RC issues related to homeland defense and

the relationship between the Guard and reserve, state and local leaders and first responders at all levels.

- An educational partnership with the National Defense University and other Senior Service College concerning the development of articles, reports and other publications, simulations, and war gaming of issues involving the Guard and Reserve for export to the states.

- A public-private partnership driven by the Board's alumni with a focus on development of an Executive Leaders Forum with the private sector. AT Kearney Inc. and Buckner & Company have agreed to serve as the Board's partners in this project.

—
—